

Tourism and Hospitality Management, Vol. 13, No. 3, pp. 711-724, 2007
 S. Jurin: THE FUTURE OF LANGUAGES FOR SPECIAL PURPOSES IN THE ERA...



UDC 811:65.012.4
Subject review
Received: 10.10.2007

THE FUTURE OF LANGUAGES FOR SPECIAL PURPOSES IN THE ERA OF PROGRESSING MANAGEMENT

Suzana Jurin
 University of Rijeka, Croatia¹

Abstract: The authors will give some definitions of the language of special purposes used in multinational business, and they will also describe some characteristics of this language on the morphological level and the level of word-formation.

The corpora they are using for this analysis is the corpora found in management reports of German multinational companies.

Through this analysis, the authors trace the development of such a language and they observe specific models used in management reports. Results of such an analysis will give facts for further discussions about the future of languages for special purposes in the management of multinational companies.

Key words: languages for special purposes, business policy, management reports.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper tries to examine the role and future of languages for special purposes (LSP) from the aspect of global changes that are imposed by the modern world. The analysis is to be conducted on a small part of a rich corpora (for the most part manager reports), which has been gathered for the purpose of morphological, syntactic and semantic language analysis that is used in the management of more or less successful German corporations.² In order to be able to examine this aspect, we need to be familiar with the definitions of LSP. Main ideas of this paper will be based

¹ **Suzana Jurin**, M.Sc. Assistant, University of Rijeka, Faculty of Philosophy, Department of German language and literature, Rijeka, Croatia.

² See corpora source on p. 724

on definitions of LSP from the communicational aspect and the role that LSP have in the communication process. Since LSP include a specialized vocabulary (type depends on the narrow purpose), the process that any LSP, and of course language of management undergoes, needs to be taken into consideration. This is a process of standardization and terminologization. The most important part in the analysis of this paper is the analysis of loanwords in the management vocabulary. This analysis will illustrate how the language of management in German corporations tries to overcome constant changes and innovations that are for the most part introduced by the Anglo-Saxon cultural circle.

2. LANGUAGES FOR SPECIAL PURPOSES FROM THE ASPECT OF COMMUNICATION

Some linguists define LSP according to a very simple communication model.³ A communication model distinguishes following elements: producer and recipient of a written or oral content. The communication model works as following: the producer⁴ controls the production and reception of his text (content). Therefore is the reception of the text (content) an active process in which the recipient is allowed to process his text independently. Communication aided by LSP need not necessarily take place between two persons and be linear, but it can take place between more producers (groups of authors) or more recipients (groups of recipients, audience). Communication may develop in multiple directions at the same time, so that participants of the communication process change roles many times. Thus the producer becomes the recipient and vice versa. In this communication process, both the producer and the recipient have their own sign system, a background or fore knowledge of the subject of communication, and general knowledge of the scientific field which is the subject of communication. This language inventory, that both producer and recipient of the communication process have at their disposal is so called "cotext" and context.

2.1. Definitions of different LSP models

According to what has already been said, there are three different approaches to scientific research of LSP. The models have been defined throughout the years, so the first model, or the systematic linguistic inventory model was defined in the 1950s. It persisted until the 1970s, and has been applied to a large number of different variations. This model is primarily defined as a manifestation of a mutual sign system that both the producer and the recipient use. It presents the language for special purposes as a sign system that is exclusively used in particular professions. This model is based on the lexical inventory and syntactical rules of LSP. A well-known definition of LSP from the 1970s is based on this model: LSP is a sum of all linguistic 'means'

³ compare Roelcke 1999, p.15

⁴ The word 'producer' has been chosen to denote the creator of a written and oral language content, because the author believes that the words 'sender' and 'emitter' designate the creator of oral language content only. For the same reason the word 'recipient' is used when referring to the receiver of both oral and written language content.

that are applied in a specialized and narrow communication field in order to ensure mutual intelligibility among people working in that field.⁵

The second definition of the model is rooted in the 1980s. It refers to a pragmalinguistic contextual model which offers a revision of the systematic linguistic inventory model, and defines LSP as a sign system closely dependent on the structure of a specialized text, and its co(n)textual interdependency. Thus this model defines LSP as a contextual written and spoken communication, but only when closely bound to the LSP sign system. This model also provides a definition of a specialized text: A specialized text is an instrument and outcome of an acquired linguistic communication activity which is related to the specialized social and productive human field of activity. The text consists of a definite number of logically interpolated elements which are arranged into coherent sentences (germ.Texteme⁶) or sentence units according to semantic and syntactic rules. These coherent sentences or sentence units are similar to complex propositions and assumptions of elaborate linguistic signs which exist in the human mind, and correspond at the same time to the objective reality.”⁷

This, at first sight completely realistic conception of language is generally approved and based on the assumption that the real world, independent of human thought consists of different objects and contents. Man assigns concepts, words and sentences that exactly correspond to these objects and contents. Such concepts, names, words and sentences are generally accepted and conventional at the same time.

With the knowledge and ideas gained from the systematic linguistic inventory model and the pragmalinguistic contextual model, the research of functional and psychological aspects of communication has come out from the research of LSP. This poses at the same time ground for the next model definition. The third model definition highlights the importance of the producer and the recipient. This model is called a cognitive linguistic functional model, and examines intellectual and emotional communicative predispositions of the producer and recipient. It analyzes psychological and intellectual abilities and willingness to communicate in the LSP.

Basic elements of research are motivation and intention of the producer and recipient, i.e. participants of a communication process which is based on LSP. According to the cognitive model the following definition was created in the 1990: Communication based on LSP is an act performed by the producer and recipient, which is internally or externally motivated or stimulated by particular systems of recognition and cognitive processes. This act is important for the differentiation between real professionals or entire communities, groups of experts, i.e. producers and recipients who communicate using LSP.⁸

⁵ compare Roelcke 1999, p.15-17

⁶ The expression “Textem” is an unprocessed language structure, in contrast to a text which is a processed language structure (according to Brockhaus Wahrig 1984).

⁷ see Hoffmann 1988, p.126.

⁸ see Hoffmann 1993, p.614

2.2. Languages for special purposes as a language variety

Within the linguistic framework a variety refers to a language system which is subordinated or regulated according to the standards of a 'source'⁹ language (German, English, Croatian or any other language system). The language variety is determined by its inner uniformity and some external differentiating features which exist outside that language system. So, the variety is different from other varieties of the same language system.¹⁰

When discussing inner uniformity or inner features of a language system, we refer to phonological, morphological, lexical and syntactic features or criteria. If subject of discourse is a realized language structure, or a text, than we are discussing semantic, grammatical or pragmatic criteria. However, external differentiating features refer to specific qualities which are conditioned by geographic position, social grouping, field of human activity or a historical period in which these specific qualities can be applied. According to the domination of these extra linguistic specific qualities, there are regional, social, functional and historical varieties.

If we define LSP as a variety, we need first of all to determine its 'status' within the linguistic concept of the same.¹¹

An important question arises at this point: Can LSP be seen as a single or a multiple language system, i.e. can we talk about a single language for special purposes or about many languages for special purposes?¹² Another important question is whether LSP can be defined and analyzed only in relation to the source language (German, English, Croatian), the variety of which this particular LSP is. In other words, LSP within the German language system can be analyzed for example only as being part of the German and not of the Croatian or English language system. Or can the LSP be analyzed as such not regarding the German, English or Croatian language system; i.e. can LSP be analyzed and defined in all languages in the same way? Answer to these questions can be given using the example of German. The German language system consists of a number of LSP (according to a large number of fields of human activity). Therefore there are also different communication fields in different LSP which at the same time display a series of similar and identical inner system features with other LSP from different source language systems (e.g. English, Italian, Spanish, and other language systems). Therefore the concept of LSP as a variety has become a necessity.

2.2.1. Functional and social predispositions of LSP as a variety

LSP is usually seen as a functional variety. This means that factors for determining a function that this LSP performs, influence the definition of the LSP

⁹ The word 'source' is used for a completely standardized language system.

¹⁰ The word "variety" is used in the text as an equivalent of the word 'language variety', which is defined according to the Croatian Encyclopaedic Dictionary as *one of the phenomena of a linguistically same language* (HER 2002:1410).

¹¹ compare Ammon 1998, Roelcke 1999, p.18

¹² see Roelcke 1999, p.18-19

itself. However, we must not neglect the fact that the emergence and development of LSP has been mostly determined by regional, social and historical conditions. For example, historical reality and facts have created conditions for the development of LSP in the field of technology, along with the development and innovations caused by the Industrial Revolution. Another example is a regionally conditioned development of LSP in the field of maritime affairs and shipping industry (which have developed because of the vicinity of sea, river, lake and other waters). The third example for socially conditioned development of LSP is the field of architecture which comprises words such as cottages, pile dwellings and in recent history, skyscrapers. These social conditions which cause the emergence and development of LSP support the argument that LSP is most of all a social variety. Therefore the words 'language of the group' or 'grouping' serve as a characterization of LSP. Along with a linguistic conception of a variety, for already mentioned reasons, other conceptions of LSP have been created, too.

2.3. Language for special purposes as a sublanguage

One of these conceptions is a referential determination of LSP which analyzes LSP as a sublanguage.¹³ Sublanguage is defined as a language system within the source language system which enables communication in a specialized field of human activity. The referential determination of LSP is supposed to depend on the functional definition of LSP.

2.4. Language for special purposes as a register

Another concept of LSP is a stylistic definition which sees LSP as a stylistic, functional or different language register. Therefore LSP is seen as a sum of stylistic elements which refer to particular communicational functions of LSP. Thus they represent a situational linguistic standard for the specialized field. However, this standard is subordinated to the field of human activity for which it was intended, which leads us back to the conclusion that such a stylistic definition is subordinated to the functional one.

3. STANDARDIZATION AND TERMINOLOGIZATION OF LANGUAGES FOR SPECIAL PURPOSES

LSP is a system of linguistic means which exercises a certain conventionality in relation to the general language. It can also be said that rules and regulations underlying LSP need not always correspond to the semantic, syntactic or pragmatic rules of the general language. LSP is allowed a particular singularity regarding the regulation of rules within the language system. Therefore it is generally believed that principles of arbitrariness and conventionality can be analyzed within LSP. This language system uses arbitrariness and a need for conventionality of linguistic means

¹³ The word 'sublanguage' is used for a substandard of a standard language system in which it exists, and it is a translation of the German word 'Subsprache' (see Roelcke 1999, p. 19).

and contents, in order to be able to thoroughly perform its function in a particular field. Description and prescription play an important role in the realization of such functions. The prescriptive method introduces innovations into the specialized vocabulary, and in that case we can talk about standardization of a specialized text.

Standardization of specialized vocabulary is a global phenomenon, which is a result of differentiation of each particular field of science and its specialized language. The need for standardization is so great that standardization in scientific and technical fields has become strictly institutionalized, i.e. institutes are established that are responsible for standardization of specialized and scientific fields, and therefore for standardization of language. Such institutions are: das Deutsche Institut für Normung (DIN) or the International Organization for Standardization (ISO). Standardization that is supervised by these institutions is usually restricted only to the lexical level. Norms are further analyzed in the process, and discussed independently of linguistic circles of scientists working at universities. Not taking into account the expertise of linguists results in a number of problems and undefined situations.¹⁴

Prescriptive standardization of the specialized vocabulary is usually defined as terminologization. Terminologization is a scientific discipline which performs the function of describing or standardizing one or more specialized vocabularies within one or more LSP (in such cases the comparative or contrastive analysis is used). Gerhard Budin gives the following definition of terminology: "...geordnete Menge von Begriffen eines Fachgebietes mit den ihnen zugeordneten Begriffszeichen".¹⁵ The word concept or notion (German 'Begriff') is the key word for defining the concept of terminology as well as terminology as a scientific discipline. It is defined by Budin as: "...Denkeinheit die einem abstrakten Gegenstand zugeordnet ist und diesen im Denken vertritt...".¹⁶ This definition is based on the traditional conceptual logic which has been studied by Eugen Wüsters. So, main idea of this definition is that a 'concept' is a cognitive realization of objects and phenomena which are part of the extra linguistic reality and which exist independently of words in particular languages or language in general. This means that a concept as such is approved or defined independently of the language in which it exists. It establishes a relation to other phenomena which are described by other concepts. Such a system can only be studied according to the principles of terminologization of one or more languages (which has already been mentioned when referring to the contrastive method). Concepts are realized only after they find their place and relationship to other elements in the sign system (i.e. when they find their equivalents in the sign system). Only then can a concept become a means of communication of a particular LSP, and part of the terminology of particular specialized and scientific fields.

The process of terminologization and standardization unfolds in ideal conditions in such a way that postulates of international research in a particular specialized and scientific field become standards of the same (according to criteria of institutions for standardization, e.g. ISO and DIN). As a parallel process there is

¹⁴ compare Roelcke 1999, p.104

¹⁵ Budin, Gerhard, Wissensorganisation und Terminologie. Die Komplexität und Dynamik wissenschaftlicher Informations- und Kommunikationsprozesse. Forum für Fachsprachenforschung 28, Tübingen, 1996, p.1-10

¹⁶ Budin 1996, p.1-10

terminologization of such standards within the same field. Whenever the standard is realized, there is a danger that communication within LSP does not unfold as automatically as it should. Therefore the next step is to define specialized and linguistic fundamental elements for the prescription of specialized vocabulary, and this is a task to be performed by ISO. Terminologization within a specialized field of a single language is conducted with the help of the development of more or less connected terminological systems for a particular specialized and scientific field. Institutions such as DIN or ON (Österreichisches Normungsinstitut) harmonize or coordinate terminological systems of particular languages in their countries (Germany and Austria), and such harmonized terminological systems are then subjected to revision which is carried out by international institutions for standardization.

In Germany the standardization of LSP is performed by DIN and VDE (Verband deutscher Elektrotechniker). These institutions are not national organizations, but they registered and function like associations. At the international level, standardization of LSP is performed by ISO. This organization was established in 1946 as a successor of ISA (International Federation of the Standardizing Associations) which was founded in 1926. ISO performs among other things also the standardization of language. Its main function is the international coordination of national standards of particular countries, as well as the development of international standards for the promotion and simplification of scientific, technical and economical processes. Seat of the organization is in Geneva and the organization enjoys a status of an association according to regulations of Swiss civil law.¹⁷

Standardization that this organization performs is conducted at six levels: Proposal Stage, Preparatory Stage, Committee Stage, Enquiry Stage, Approval Stage and Publication Stage.

Publication and approval of particular standards is at best done every five years. Other international organizations for standardization are: IEC (International Electrotechnical Commission), IUPAC (International Union for Pure and Applied Chemistry), WHO (World Health Organization), and others.

The German institute for standardization defines standardization as following: "Normung ist die planmäßige, durch die interessierten Kreise gemeinschaftlich durchgeführte Vereinheitlichung von materiellen und immateriellen Gegenständen zum Nutzen der Allgemeinheit. Sie darf nicht zu einem wirtschaftlichen Sondervorteil einzelner führen. Sie fördert die Rationalisierung und Qualitätssicherung in Wirtschaft, Technik, Wissenschaft und Verwaltung. Sie dient der Sicherheit von Menschen und Sachen sowie der Qualitätsverbesserung in allen Lebensbereichen. Sie dient außerdem einer sinnvollen Ordnung und der Information auf dem jeweiligen Normungsgebiet. Die Normung wird auf nationaler, regionaler und internationaler Ebene durchgeführt".¹⁸

¹⁷ compare Roelcke 1999, p.113

¹⁸ DIN 820, part 1, 1994

This definition is essential for the determination of standards according to the DIN 2342 regulation: "Festlegen von Terminologie und Grundsätzen für das Erarbeiten, Bearbeiten, Verarbeiten und Darstellen von Terminologie durch autorisierte und dafür fachlich, sprachlich und methodisch qualifizierte Gremien mit dem Ziel, terminologische Normen zu schaffen."¹⁹ These standards as such are not completely approved because they do not regard certain linguistic aspects of the systematic linguistic inventory model. New standardization regulations are later directed to following linguistic aspects: aspects of objects, phenomena and language, aspect of the level of determining concepts, aspect of the level of describing objects and phenomena, as well as the aspect of processing and presentation of dictionaries.²⁰ Such a standard is also DIN 2330 which is based on linguistic aspects, and involves following regulations: regulation on object, phenomenon and concept (notion), content of the concept and range of its usage, as well as the regulation on applicable signs and sign systems (thus we are referring to natural and artificial languages, designation or conceptual definition and names). This norm also explicates relationships between concepts, with special regard to the nature of relationship and the great variety when attributing certain concepts to certain phenomena (this is called determination, conjunction, disjunction, integration). Features of particular concepts are also distinguished and categorized as such. Next step of standardization (DIN 2338 in this case) is to define the concept according to the aspect of semiotics. This means that the sign, its usage and meaning are very important in this process. In other words, we are talking about the body or shape of a sign, its meaning and function, and the sign system to which this sign belongs.

One of the tasks of the German institute for standardization is the creation and harmonization of international dictionaries that comprise different human fields of activity and different languages (DIN 2332). The specialized dictionary is defined as a "...geordnete Sammlung von Benennungen der Begriffe eines Fachgebietes..."²¹ A unit or a single concept found in a specialized dictionary is defined as "... kleinste selbständige Einheit in einem Fachwörterbuch, d.h. die Darstellung einer eindeutigen Zuordnung zwischen Begriff und Benennung..."²² The words 'Begriff' and 'Benennung' may be translated as 'concept' and 'name', and analyzed from the aspect of source language, i.e. the language in which definitions of concepts are created. These words may also be analyzed from the aspect of target language, i.e. the language in which equivalents are found as well as other information related to that concept (in bilingual or multilingual dictionaries).

In that process we can observe which importance a particular specialized concept is given, as a metalinguistic definition of the meaning of first level concept, i.e. source language level. In contrast to that, the importance of the meaning of second level concept is analyzed, i.e. the metalinguistic definition at target language level.²³

¹⁹ DIN 3242, part 2, 1992

²⁰ compare Roelcke, 1999, p. 116

²¹ DIN 2333, 1997

²² ibid

²³ compare Roelcke 1999, p. 199

At this point, it is important to mention some general terminology standards according to ISO. These are the ISO standard 1087 which defines concepts connected to language and reality, and the ISO standard 704 which defines linguistic theoretical regulations of international terminologization, and inspects concepts as well as their relation to objects and phenomena, and their features (concepts, objects, characteristics, intension, extension, etc.). Such concepts are bilingual; they exist in French and English.

4. LOANWORDS IN VOCABULARY AS INDICATORS OF CHANGE

The language of management progresses every day and follows world trends. Therefore the vocabulary of management is constantly enriched and expanded. Equivalent expressions are not always found for particular phenomena in language of management in German; therefore this language borrows or integrates foreign words into its vocabulary. This phenomenon is significant for the future and general approval as well as the definition of language of management. The following question arises: To which degree is one LSP able to integrate and adapt a large number of loanwords without suffering consequences of 'Anglization' or 'Americanization' of an entire specialized vocabulary?

Hoffmann lists five methods for the expansion of specialized vocabulary. These are borrowing (Entlehnung) from other languages (the language of management borrows from the most part words from English), loan translation (Lehnübersetzung), metaphoric use of words from general or specialized vocabulary (der metaphorische Gebrauch), metonymy (die Metonymie), extension or intension (definitorische Erweiterung oder Einengung), different methods of word formation (Methoden der Wortbildung), and what Hoffmann calls "die schöpferische Definition."²⁴ Foreign words that are used in our everyday conversation are called loanwords. Such words are not entirely linguistically adapted, and their spelling is not adapted too.²⁵

Loanwords are only partly substituted in the receptor language (unlike calques). Loanwords are words which are only partly adapted in the receptor language, because they retain some linguistic features of the language they were borrowed from, and are at the same time more or less integrated into the receptor language.²⁶ Most loanwords that are found in the German language of management come from English. However there are also loanwords taken over from some other languages. Reason for this is the development of management science, for all trends referring to management, organization and function of companies, associations, movements or other institutions came from the United States. How loanwords enter the language of management is simple to explain. Whenever there is a lexical gap in the management language, the missing word is found in some other language (usually American English); it is borrowed and used in German. Before the element was borrowed, it had all morphological and phonological features of the language it belonged to (donor language). The receptor language keeps associations, (such elements are then called loanwords) or these features are adapted to the language system of the receptor language (such elements are called calques).

²⁴ Hoffmann 1985, p. 154-8

²⁵ compare Babic 1994, p. 65

²⁶ compare Filipovic 1986, p.49

When talking about spoken language, the borrowed element is called a model, if pronounced exactly the same as in source language; and if pronounced according to phonological rules of receptor language, then it is called a replica (reproduction)²⁷. In management language such replicas were taken over from English, so they are called Anglicism²⁸. Whenever a model is adapted and becomes a replica, there are variants as regards its spelling and pronunciation. 1. the original (English) spelling may be retained, e.g. know-how or Value-at-Risk; 2. the word can be spelled the way it sounds in English; 3. sometimes there are also examples of a mixed type in which only part of the word has retained the original spelling, e.g. Risk-Modell or Crash-Situation. In the Preface to the Dictionary of Foreign Words, Anic claims that: "English influences the integrity of each European and non-European language. In some parts of the international public life English has the same position that Latin used to have once. English vocabulary is expanding due to sophisticated knowledge of technology and scientific disciplines. The nontraditional life style and the process of globalization in new artistic, cultural and sub cultural creations is another reason for the expansion of English. English offers its vocabulary to other languages. This vocabulary need not always be literally English, but a selection of international words from English, and their meaning...". Anic furthermore explains: "From the sociological point of view, Anglicism was adopted after the Second World War. It is primarily the vocabulary of informed citizens."²⁹

In his analysis of Anglicism in the magazine Spiegel, Yang distinguishes three different types of Anglicism:

- 1 Conventionalized Anglicism: "Die Anglisten in dieser Gruppe werden als allgemein üblich und bekannt vorausgesetzt, obwohl sie sich in der Artikulationsart und/oder Orthographie häufig anders verhalten als einheimisches Wortgut, z.B. Computer, Manager, Keks, Rock n Roll, Jeans, Sex u.a. Nach dem Sprachgefühl vieler Deutscher sind sie keine Fremdwörter mehr."
- 2 Anglicism in the process of conventionalization: "Im Gegensatz zur ersten Gruppe kommen die Anglizismen dieser Gruppe vielen Deutschen fremd vor. Trotzdem werden sie im Spiegel verwendet. Es liegt die Hypothese nahe, daß diese Anglizismen nach einiger Zeit entweder konventionelle Wörter werden, oder aus dem deutschen Sprachgebrauch verschwinden werden. Als Beispiele für Anglizismen dieser Kategorie sind u.a. Factory, Gay, Underdog anzuführen."
- 3 Quoted words, personal names, etc.: "Die Anglizismen in dieser Gruppe werden nur in einer bestimmten Situation oder in Zusammenhang mit Amerika, England, Kanada oder anderen englischsprachigen Ländern gebraucht. Beispiele hierfür sind Boat People, High School, Highway, Western usw."³⁰

²⁷ Compare Filipovic, 1986, p.38

²⁸ Anglicism refers to all words that are part of English culture and civilization, and designate an object, idea or phenomenon. Such a word need not necessarily be of English origin.

²⁹ Anic/Goldstein 2002, p.10

³⁰ Yang, Wenliang, Anglizismen im Deutschen. Niemeyer, Tübingen, 1990, p. 9

When talking about Anglicism in the context of word formation, Moser says: "Bei der Bildung des Substantivs wirken zwei entgegengesetzte Tendenzen: die zur Synthese und eine andere zur Verkürzung".³¹ Anglicism is often found in the form of simple words (e.g. Team, Club, Test, etc.). Such words tend to form compounds in German. Reason for that is an attempt at detailed expression and communication.

Yang distinguishes two sub groups of compounds (Anglicism):

- 1 Compounds consisting for the most part of English elements, such as Airbus, Airport, Callgirl, etc.³²
- 2 Mixed compounds (hybrid forms), which are composed of English, German or other foreign elements and are compounded according to German word formation rules. According to Yang, this type is the commonest type of compounds. Yang distinguishes here following categories³³:
 - a) Compounds with German element as the basic compound and English element as the modifier, as in Apartment-Haus, Babypuder, etc.
 - b) Compounds with English element as the basic compound and German element as the modifier, as in Krisenmanagement, Kuhbaby, etc.
 - c) Phrasal compounds, as in Moment-mal-bitte-ich-muß-mal-nachsehen-Story, etc.

Classification and analysis of Anglicism and loanwords in this paper in general is based on Duden 5, Fremdwörterbuch and Duden 7, Herkunftswörterbuch, as well as the Oxford Dictionary of European Anglicism, and on the classification undertaken by authors who were already mentioned in this paper.

Corpora analysis of the language of management does not make a distinction between loanwords and calques. This paper also tries to analyze other loanwords, besides Anglicism. Corpora situation is the following (analysis of 300 corpora examples):

Anglicism with exclusively English elements:

Actionmanagement, Aktiencrash, At-the-money-Calls, Backtesting, Barings, Bayer-Calls, beyond Basle, Bid/Ask-Spreads, Capital, Controlling, Costmanagement, Crash, Crash-Management, Deep-out-of-the-money-calls, Forwards, Future, Holding, Input, In-the-money, Global Derivatives, kompatibel, Konfidenz, Konzern, Management, Manager, Marketing, Marketingmanagement, mark-to-market, Maximum Loss, New Product Process, Orange County, Out-of-the-money, Partner, Put, Return, Risk, Short-Put, Stress, Stresstest, Study Group, Swaps, Teammanagement, Test, Top-Manager, Topmanagement.

Anglicism – mixed compounds:

Backtestingstrategien, Bondkurve, Crash-Situation, Defaultwahrscheinlichkeiten, Extremfall, Extremsituation, Holdinggesellschaft, Inputwerte, Intraday-Limiten, Intraday-Überwachung,

³¹ Moser, H., Deutsche Sprachgeschichte. 6.edition, Tübingen, 1969, p. 174

³² Yang says: "Es gibt auch einige Komposita mit englischen Komponenten, die keine englische Vorlage nachweise können. Sie sind sogenannte Scheinentlehnungen, die im Deutschen mit englischen Wortbildungselementen analog zu den im Englischen vorhandenen ähnlichen Sprachzeichen gebildet worden sind. Die Zusammensetzungen wie Callboy (analog Callgirl), Dressmann, Showmaster, Sportmaster und Talkmaster (analog zu Quizmaster) gehören zu dieser Unterkategorie" (Yang 1990, p.138).

³³ Yang, 1990, p. 38

Konzernmutter, Managementinformationen, Managementinformationssystem, Managementsystem, Mappingfehler, Marketingstrategie, Marktcrash, Performanz-Kennzahlen, Portfolioinsurance-Strategie, Principal-Agency-Problematik, Risikocontrolling, Risikomanagement, Risikoreports Short-Fall, Short-Optionen, Shortpositionen, Spillover-Effekte, Stop-Loss-Limite, Value-at-Risk-Modelle.

Words of Latin origin have also been listed, no matter how they entered German (not bearing in mind the possibility of a mediator language). A list of pure and mixed Latinism (words of Latin origin which are part of a compound that consists also of other words of non-Latin origin) is presented. So, here are some examples of *Latinism* from the same corpora examples listed above: Adjustierung, Aggregation, Aktiva, Allokation, Approximativ, Audit, Defizit, ex post, ex ante, Fazit, Korrelationen, kumuliert, Multiplikator, multiplizieren, operativ, qualitative, Quantil, Rendit, quantitative.

Latinism of a mixed type:

Adjustierungsfaktor, Entscheidungsgremium, Indexarbitrage, Kennziffer, Risikoquantifizierung, Risikoadäquanz, Mindestinformationsfrequenz, Risikotransparenz.

Graecism:

analog, Analyze, Axiomatik, Axiomatisch, Exogene, Praxis, prozyklisch, sophistiziert, System, Zyklus.

Graecism of a mixed type:

Marktphase, Paradigmenwechsel.

Italicism:

Bilanz, skizzieren, Szenarien.

Italicism of a mixed type:

Bagatellinformationen, Bilanzwirkende

Gallicism:

Branche, Portefeuilles

Gallicism of a mixed type:

Finanzdebakel, Gesamtportfolio, Handelsportfolio, Portfoliomaß, Konfidenzniveau, Optionsportefeuilles, Portfoliosensitivität, Portfoliostruktur, Portfoliowert, Teilportfolio.

As was expected, the dominance of Anglicism is obvious, for the reason of great influence of management science, and innovations coming from the USA, and the overall globalization of this scientific field. A relatively large number of "pure" Latinism (19) can be accounted for by historical events, and the origin of European languages, whereas there were 8 Latinism of a mixed type. The same goes for "pure" Graecism (10) and Graecism of a mixed type (2), while there are only few "pure" Italicism (3), and a few Italicism of a mixed type (2). A small number of pure Gallicism (2) contrasted to a larger number of mixed Gallicism (10) isn't surprising, although one might expect a larger overall number of Gallicism in German because of language contact between the two countries, and the geographical position.

5. CONCLUSION

Language for special purposes (language of management) is a sum of linguistic means that are used in the field of communication, restricted by a particular specialized field (management), in order to ensure successful communication among people working in a particular field of human activity (managers). In the communication process aided by LSP, an important role is performed by the chosen communication model and the relationship between the producer and recipient.

Analysis of loanwords shows a dominance of Anglicism. Reason for this is the great influence of management science, as well as innovations introduced by the USA, and the overall globalization of this scientific field.

In the analysis of 200 corpora examples, 46 Anglicism have been found with purely English elements and 30 Anglicism which can be classified as mixed compounds. A relatively large number of pure Latinism has been also found (19), which can be accounted for by historical events, and the origin of European languages, whereas there were 8 Latinisms of a mixed type. 10 pure Graecism and 10 Gallicisms of a mixed type were also found. Number of loanwords from other languages is relatively modest. Therefore we can talk about a significant number of integrated Anglicism which strongly influence the entire lexicon of the language of management.

The future of management LSP of German corporations can be predicted in two ways:

1. LSP that managers use will lexically more and more abound in Anglicism and Americanism, while a large number of loanwords will retain their original form and integrate into morphological and syntactic structures of German LSP. A management deng-slang will develop, which will be granted the status of a special variety within the specialized language of economy, and
2. The language of management will adapt loanwords and adjust them to the German phonological, morphological and syntactic language system. Therefore the number of adjusted neologisms will increase, and the language of management will in short periods of time initiate the process of elimination of "archaic" lexical and semantic phenomena.

REFERENCES

- Adamzik, Kirsten, *Sprache: Wege zum Verstehen*. A. Francke Verlag, Tübingen, 2004.
Aitchinson, Jean, *Words in the Mind. An Introduction to the Mental Lexicon*. Oxford 1987.
Ammon, Ulrich, *Probleme der Statusbestimmung von Fachsprachen*. In: *Fachsprachen* Bd.1. Berlin 1998, str. 219-229.
Anic, Vladimir, *Rjecnik hrvatskoga jezika*. Novi Liber, Zagreb 1994.
Anic, Vladimir, *Rjecnik hrvatskoga jezika*. Novi Liber, Zagreb 2002.
Babic, Stjepan, *Njemacke posudjenice u hrvatskom književnom jeziku*. Zagreb, 1990.
Babic, Stjepan, *Tvorba rijeci u hrvatskom književnom jeziku*. HAZU, Zagreb, 2002.

- Becker, A./Hundt, M., Die Fachsprache in der einzelsprachlichen Differenzierung. In: Fachsprachen, Bd.1,1998,s. 118-133.
- Bolten, Jürgen, Fachsprache oder Sprachbereich? Empirisch-pragmatische Grundlagen zur Beschreibung der deutschen Wirtschafts-, Medizin- und Rechtssprache. In:Theo Bungarten (Hrsg.), Beiträge zur Fachsprachenforschung: Sprache in Wissenschaft und Technik, Wirtschaft und Rechtswesen, Tostedt, s.57-72
- Brockhaus Enzyklopädie, Bd.6. F.A.Brockhaus, Wiesbaden 1968.
- Brockhaus Wahrig, Bd.2. F.A. Brockhaus, Wiesbaden 1981.
- Bußmann, Hadumond, Lexikon der Sprachwissenschaft. Alfred Kröner Verlag, Stuttgart, 2002.
- Duden 2, Stilwörterbuch der deutschen Sprache.Dudenverlag, Mannheim, 1988.
- Duden 4, Grammatik. Dudenverlag, Mannheim, 1984.
- Duden, Die deutsche Rechtschreibung. Dudenverlag, Mannheim, 1996.
- Duff, A., The Third Language. Recurrent problems of translation into English. Pergamon Press, Oxford 1981.
- Filipovic, Rudolf (1986), Teorija jezika u kontaktu, Zagreb, JAZU/SK.
- Filipovic, R., Anglizmi u hrvatskom ili srpskom jeziku:Porijeklo-Razvoj-Znacenje. JAZU-Skolska knjiga, Zagreb, 1990
- Hoffmann, L., Fachsprachenlinguistik zwischen Praxisdruck und Theoriebedarf. In DaF 28, Heft 3, Tübingen, 1991, S.131-140.
- Hoffmann, L., Kommunikationsmittel Fachsprache.Eine Einführung.Tübingen, 1985.
- Hoffmann, L., Vom Fachwort zum Fachtext. Beiträge zur angewandten Linguistik.Günter Narr Verlag, Tübingen,1988.
- Hoffmann,L., Fachsprachenlinguistik und Fachbezogene Fremdsprachenausbildung. In: Die Neueren Sprachen 5/1989.
- Hoffmann, Lothar, Fachwissen und Fachkommunikation.Zur Dialektik von Systematik und Linearität in den Fachsprachen. In: Bungarten, Bd.2, 1993, s. 614.
- Hundt, Markus, Neuere institutionelle und wissenschaftliche Wirtschaftssprachen. In: Lothar Hoffmann/Hartwig Kahlverkämper/Ernst Wiegand (Hrsg).Fachsprachen.Ein Internationales Handbuch zur Fachsprachenforschung und Terminologiewissenschaft. 1.Halbband, Berlin, New York, s.1296-1304.
- Muhvic-Dimanovski, V., Anglicism in German: the problem of variants.In:Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabienia, br.42, 1997, s.269-274.
- Muhvic-Dimanovski, V., Neologizmi na razmedji jezikne otvorenosti i jezičnog purizma.In:Filologija 30-31, Zagreb,1998, s.495-499.
- Muhvic-Dimanovski, V., Neologizmi. Problemi, teorije i primjene.Zavod za lingvistiku FF u Zagrebu, Zagreb, 2005.
- Muhvic-Dimanovski , V., Neology in Language.In:Collegium Antropologicum, 28 Suppl.1,2004,p.140
- Roelcke, Thorsten, Fachsprachen. Erich Schmidt Verlag GmbH, Berlin 1999.
- Yang, Wenliang, Anglizismen im Deutschen. Niemeyer, Tübingen, 1990.
- Zindler,H., Anglizismen in der deutschen Presse nach 1945. Diss.Universität Kiel, 1959.
- Zindler, H., Anglizismen im heutigen Deutsch beobachtet in der Sprache der Presse 1945-1960. In: Beiträge zu den Fortbildungskursen des Goethe-Instituts für ausländische Deutschlehrer an Schulen und Hochschulen, München, 1975, S.82-91.
- www.ids.manheim.de
- www.fachsprache.uni-hannover.de
- Corpora:
- Dr.Keller, Thomas, Enterpreneurship durch Holdingstrukturen.(Hrsg.)Consultatnts GmbH und Keller Postfolio Value Management GmbH, Düsseldorf/Frankfurt, 2001.
- Dr.Berentzen B.Jan, Die Holding-Organisationsform marktorientierter Wachstumsstrategien der Brentzen-Gruppe AG. (Hrsg.)Berrentzen-Gruppe AG, Haselünne, 1999.
- Dr.May, Peter, Von den „May-Werken“ zur „May Gruppe“. (Hrsg.) INTES Gesellschaft für integrierte Eignerberatung mbH, Bonn 2001.
- Dr.Dreyer, Jörg-D, Nordenia International AG:Aufbau einer Managementholding. In: Die Holding im Mittelstand.Leitfaden zur Umsetzung moderner Managementsysteme.Wirtschaftsverlag Bachem, Köln, 1999.
- Veker, Michael, Crash in den USA im Jahre 1987. In: Risikomanagement an internationalen Finanzmärkten., Schäffer-Poeschel Verlag, Stuttgart, 2000.
- www.management.de

Copyright of *Tourism & Hospitality Management* is the property of Tourism & Hospitality Management and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.